

JOSEPH P. RUSSONIELLO (CSBN 44332)
United States Attorney

BRIAN J. STRETCH (CSBN 163173)
Chief, Criminal Division

SUSAN KNIGHT (CSBN 209013)
Assistant United States Attorney

REID DAVIS
Law Clerk

150 Almaden Blvd., Suite 900
San Jose, California 95113
Telephone: (408) 535-5036
FAX: (408) 535-5066
RMDavis@usa.doj.gov

Attorneys for Plaintiff

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN JOSE DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)	No. CR 08-00087 RS
Plaintiff,)	
v.)	STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED]
)	ORDER EXCLUDING TIME
MARIA CONSUELO MACHUCA)	
ZUNIGA,)	
a/k/a Maria Consuelo Gomez,)	SAN JOSE VENUE
a/k/a Maria Consuelo Machuca Gomez,)	
Defendant.)	

On March 13, 2008, the parties in this case appeared before the Court for an arraignment on an information. After the defendant was arraigned and entered a plea of not guilty, Assistant Federal Public Defender Lara Vinnard and the government agreed that the Court schedule the case for a status hearing on March 27, 2008. Reid Davis, Law Clerk for the United States Attorney's Office, then requested an exclusion of time under the Speedy Trial Act from March 13, 2008 until March 27, 2008 in order for the government to provide discovery to the defendant. The defendant, through AFPD Lara Vinnard, agreed to the exclusion. The undersigned parties

agree and stipulate that an exclusion of time is appropriate based on the defendant's need for effective preparation of counsel.

SO STIPULATED:

JOSEPH P. RUSSONIELLO
United States Attorney

DATED: 3/25/08

/s/
SUSAN KNIGHT
Assistant United States Attorney

DATED: 3/25/08

/s/
Assistant Federal Public Defender
Counsel for the defendant

Accordingly, for good cause shown, the Court HEREBY ORDERS that time be excluded under the Speedy Trial Act from March 13, 2008 to March 27, 2008. The Court finds, based on the aforementioned reasons, that the ends of justice served by granting the requested continuance outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. The failure to grant the requested continuance would deny defense counsel reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence, and would result in a miscarriage of justice. The Court therefore concludes that this exclusion of time should be made under 18 U.S.C. §§ 3161(h)(8)(A) and (B)(iv).

SO ORDERED.

DATED: _____

NANDOR J. VADAS
United States Magistrate Judge